

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated September 15, 2008 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Claim 1 is amended to incorporate subject matter from claim 5. Claim 5 is canceled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein. No claims have been added. Accordingly, claims 1-4 and 6-15 are currently pending. Reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 3,718,982 to *Deaton* (hereinafter “*Deaton*”). Office Action at page 2. Claim 5 is cancelled herein, accordingly, the rejection of that claim is moot. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of the remaining claims and requests reconsideration.

Independent claim 1 is allowable over the cited reference in that claim 1 recites a combination of elements including, for example, “at least one securing member for securing the filter main body to the filter housing, wherein the securing member includes a convex portion configured to contact the filter main body, and a supporting protrusion spaced away from the convex portion to support the convex portion when the filter main body is seated in the filter housing.” *Deaton* does not teach or suggest at least these features of the claimed invention.

The Office purports that *Deaton* discloses “at least one securing member 92 for securing the filter main body to the filter housing.” *Office Action* at p. 2. *Deaton*’s reference number 92 refers to a leaf spring where a “lower portion of the frame 88 is snap-fastened within the pocket by a leaf spring 92.” *Deaton* at col. 3:27-29 and FIG. 2. As shown, *Deaton*’s leaf spring 92 does not include, at least, “a supporting protrusion spaced away from the convex portion to support the convex portion when the filter main body is seated in the filter housing,” as recited in independent claim 1. *Deaton*’s leaf spring 92 secures the filter 82 by having one end fixed to filter housing 40 and its other end in slidable contact with a surface of the lower portion 32 of the front wall of the dryer. Thus, *Deaton* has no need for, and does not disclose, “a supporting protrusion spaced away from the convex portion to support the convex portion when

the filter main body is seated in the filter housing,” as recited in independent claim 1. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection of independent claim 1. Claims 2-4 and 6-9 depend from independent claim 1. It stands to reason that the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of those dependent claims should be withdrawn as well.

Claims 10-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 3,648,381 to Fox (hereinafter “Fox”). Office Action at page 5. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection and requests reconsideration.

Independent claim 10 is allowable over the cited reference in that claim 10 recites a combination of elements including, for example, “a pressing member configured to protrude from the guiding rail toward the filter main body, and push the filter main body toward the filter housing.” *Fox* does not disclose at least these features of the claimed invention.

In contrast, *Fox* merely discloses a “plurality of short resilient clip means 66” where a “a guard 70 and screen 76 as thus assembled can be placed in circular flange 64 ... with the resilient clip means 66 having sufficient movement to permit assembly and snapping back to normal position to retain in assembled position.” *Fox* at col. 3:17 and lines 45-49 and FIG. 3. As shown, clip means 66 retains guard 70 and is not configured to contact the filter main body. Thus, *Fox* does not teach or suggest “a pressing member configured to protrude from the guiding rail toward the filter main body, and push the filter main body toward the filter housing,” as recited in independent claim 10. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection of independent claim 10. Claims 11-15 depend from independent claim 10. It stands to reason that the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection of those dependent claims should be withdrawn as well.

Claims 1-15 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-4 of copending Application No. 11/938,949. Office Action at p. 4. As this is a provisional rejection and both applications are still pending, Applicant will address this rejection upon an indication of allowability.